



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

KAISER JULIAN, DER ABTRÜNNIGE. Seine Jugend und Kriegsthaten bis zum Tode des Kaisers Constantius (331–361). Eine Quellenuntersuchung. Von DR. WILHELM KOCH. Leipzig: Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1899. Pp. 160. M. 5.

VOLTAIRE's saying, that to utter Julian's name without the epithet "Apostate" would be perhaps the greatest possible effort of the human mind, was inspired by the fact that Voltaire's contemporaries maintained that the word correctly summed up the emperor's whole life and character. Julian's was a personality and a career that could leave no one indifferent, and the story of his acts and motives is clouded by party passion. We do not look to any of his biographers for historical impartiality, but it is in the pages of the pagan Hellenists, and not in the Christian Fathers, that we find moderation of language in dealing with the views of opponents. The fact that they wrote under Christian emperors, and so were constrained to curb their sympathies, is, in some cases, an explanation; but this would not apply to Libanius, for of the eight works that he devoted to Julian one only was composed under a Christian régime. Libanius was a rhetorician who has little historical worth; Eunapius falls in the same category; so it is on Ammianus Marcellinus and on Julian himself that Julian's biographers are forced to rely. It had been, until recently, the fashion to regard Ammianus as a trustworthy authority, whose occasional criticisms of Julian proved his impartiality. The exposure of the incoherence and inconsistencies of Ammianus, begun by Hecker in 1886, was carried on more scientifically by von Borries, who, in a searching analysis (in *Hermes*, 1892), indicated that Ammianus, with a perfect lack of criticism and a slavish faithfulness, had employed two sources, distinct and often contradictory. These are: (1) Julian's lost work on the battle of Strassburg, mentioned by Eunapius (frag. 9), the famous *βιβλίδιον*. This short account of the "Alemannen-Schlacht" was written before the rupture with Constantius and Julian's apostasy; hence we find in Ammianus up to the battle of Strassburg a respectful attitude to Constantius and language that may be interpreted as Christian (*cf.* especially, in chap. xvi, *passim*, the references to a *summum numen*). (2) The *ὑπόμνημα*, or "Memoirs," of Oribasius, Julian's friend and physician; this, however, reached Ammianus indirectly after having been worked over by a writer who was familiar with Julian's "Letter to the Athenians," and with some other Julianic letters or writings lost to us. This part of Ammianus is marked by spiteful satire against Constantius.

We have given thus fully the views of von Borries in order to compare with them Koch's treatment of the sources in the present work. Koch is less conservative than von Borries, is too inclined to press dubious parallels into evidence, and arrives at more questionable results. Besides Julian's *βιβλίδιον*, for the existence of which scholars have agreed to accept the testimony of Eunapius, Koch tries to prove that Julian, in imitation of Cæsar, wrote commentaries on his Gallic wars, which Ammianus used as his main source. The problem that scholars who investigate the sources of Ammianus, Libanius, Eunapius, and Zosimus have to envisage is whether, as Hecker thought, and Koch tries to prove, they drew from Julian himself, or only the *βιβλίδιον*, the "Letter to the Athenians," and some other letters, now lost, were at their command. Eunapius certainly refers to writings by Julian, apart from the *βιβλίδιον*, as valuable for his biographers, but we are inclined to agree with von Borries that the reference does not justify us in deducing the existence of Gallic commentaries. The passage in Zosimus (III, 2, 4), on which Koch also relies, is merely a paraphrase of Eunapius, whom, as we know with fair certainty, Zosimus abridged. Koch has no fresh evidence in support of his theory, though his arguments are ingenious.

His second thesis is that Constantius has suffered misrepresentation at the hands of Julian's biographers; he insists on the real friendliness of Constantius for Julian, a sentiment that was alienated only when his court favorites persuaded him that the Cæsar's growing power was a menace to his empire. Constantius added to a peculiarly reserved temperament the studied calm of the traditional Roman, and his true sentiments in his earlier relations with Julian have never transpired. The truth must lie somewhere between the assertions of Julian that he was saved from destruction at the instance of the empress Eusebia, because Constantius hoped that he might work his own ruin by failure in Gaul, and Koch's theory that Constantius felt a genuine kindness for his young cousin, and was liberal with chances of distinction.

Dr. Koch's book is too careful and detailed not to form an important contribution to Julianic literature. He is a Dutchman, writing German as a foreigner, but with admirable clearness. The Greek accents and breathings need revision. One fault is to be found with his presentation: he regularly quotes his Greek and Latin authorities in a German translation, so that the reader is compelled to verify each passage in the original.

When one finds so distinguished an historian of Greek literature as Maurice Croiset (Vol. V, p. 897) assuming, on the strength of the passage in Eunapius, that Gallic commentaries by Julian once existed, one realizes the necessity for such investigations as those of von Borries and Koch, which go far toward a final estimate of the true value of Ammianus and the other biographers of Julian.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE,
Bryn Mawr, Pa.

WILMER CAVE FRANCE.

KAISER JULIAN'S RELIGIÖSE UND PHILOSOPHISCHE ÜBERZEUGUNG.
VON WILHELM VOLLERT. ("Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie.") Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1899. Pp. 106. M. 1.40.

IN the religious convictions of the emperor Julian several factors are to be traced. His scholastic temperament inclined him to the only literature that could satisfy his tastes; in the course of his studies he came in contact with Neoplatonists and theurgists, who fostered and traded on his natural mysticism; his hatred of Constantius and the court party was extended to the state religion; finally he saw in the restoration of Hellenism a glittering opportunity for the satisfaction of that personal vanity which can never be left out when one reckons with the emperor Julian. There is nothing new and little to criticise in Vollert's sketch of Julian's religious and philosophical convictions; nothing certainly that will supersede Naville's handling of the subject, now more than twenty years old. Vollert contrasts Julian with Marcus Aurelius, with whom he has often been compared. Superficially the analogy is alluring, but a closer scrutiny is disastrous to Julian. The steady vision and self-abnegation of the one are a foil to the ill-regulated mysticism and restless egotism of the other; Stoicism had braced Marcus Aurelius, while Neoplatonism led Julian astray. Of late years scholars have been chary of accepting the reports of Julian's Christian historians, but in his survey of the development of Julian's religious and philosophic convictions Vollert draws indiscriminately on all the sources. He is not always abreast of the latest discussions of Julian's personal history; *e. g.*, on p. 14 he gives, without comment, the date 344 for Julian's consignment to Macellum, though Sievers and Koch agree on the year 341. On p. 23, following Eunapius, he accepts the theory that Julian twice visited Greece, though it seems more probable that he went to Athens only once, in 355, through the influence of the empress Eusebia. Vollert's bibliography is by no means complete.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE,
Bryn Mawr, Pa.

WILMER CAVE FRANCE.